

DOWNTOWN COMMISSION RESULTS

Office of the Director
50 W. Gay St.
Columbus, Ohio 43215-9040
(614) 645-8591
(614) 645-6675 (FAX)

Tuesday, March 22, 2016
77 N. Front Street, STAT Room (Lower Level)

Planning Division
50 W. Gay St.
Columbus, Ohio 43215-9040
(614) 645-8664

Downtown Commission
Daniel J. Thomas (Staff)
Urban Design Manager
(614) 645-8404
djthomas@columbus.gov

- I. Attendance**
Present: Steve Wittmann (Chair); Otto Beatty, Jr.; Michael Brown; Robert Loversidge; Mike Lusk; Jana Maniace; Danni Palmore,

Absent: Tedd Hardesty; Kyle Katz,

City Staff: Daniel Ferdelman, Daniel Blechschmidt,

- II. Approval of the February 23, 2016 Downtown Commission Meeting Results**
Motion to approve (7-0)

III. Old Business

DRAFT

Case #1 16

2:07

Address: 303 S. Front Street
Applicant: Mainline Partners, LLC
Property Owner: 303 South Front, LLC
Design Professional: M+A Architects

Request:

Report on Commission request to investigate northeast window / corner detailing. Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of new 5 story apartment building with structured parking below. CC3359.05(C)1, 3359.23 Signage approval is also requested.

The project was conditionally approved by the Commission at their December 15 meeting. See attached Results from that meeting. The current packet includes revisions of the NE corner (included is original December perspective). Signage is also included.

Discussion

Changes have been made to the NE corner windows as suggested. Floor plans and lobby has been shown. SW- Windows work well on the east elevation. JM-What about the glare from the lights into the units? A. – none. RL- Suggested mocking-up the cove lighting feature. A. – Agree.

Results

Motion (RL/MB) to approve as submitted. (7-0).

Case #2 16-3-2

11:30

Address: 580 North Fourth Street**Smith Brothers Hardware****Applicant:** Architectural Alliance**Property Owner:** SBHI c/o Capitol Equities**Design Professional :** Architectural Alliance**Request:**

Certificate of Appropriateness for a patio / enhanced entrance of the Smith Brothers Hardware Building. CC3359.05(C)1)

This was first presented to the Commission in January, 2016 along with a proposal for a rooftop venue (not part of the current submission). The Commission was largely favorable towards this proposal, but requested more detail.

Discussion

A (Rebecca) – Comments from January were addressed. Construction drawings presented. Old truss forms utilized. 580 entry feature added for directional clarity added. Materials brought. Retractable fabric for lighting. JM- Stated the arch is a good addition to the structure.

Results

Motion (MB/DP) to approve as submitted. (7-0).

V. New Business Request for Certificate of Appropriateness**Case #3 16-3-3**

16:50

Address: 111 South Grant Avenue Street**Grant Medical Center****Applicant & Property Owner:** Grant Medical Center**Attorney:** Doug Shevelow Bricker & Eckler LLP**Design Professional :** Design Group**Request:**

Certificate of Appropriateness for a new helipad and other additions – see applicant's project summary. CC3359.05(C)1)

Discussion

Helipads are listed in the Code as requiring use approval. Chair will ask for two separate motions. Dave Morris (Design Group) – This will allow for less turbulence in helicopter landings and will become the primary pad of use. Proposal includes helipad and two elements of support and access to the hospital. Insulated metal panel will be used and will be the same as material already used. The helicopter pad on the medical building has been abandoned. RL – asked about the flight pattern. A – pattern would be largely the same as what is now used – from the east, over Deaf School Park. The new box for the elevator would include two elevators, a stairwell and a lobby. MB – has there been any outreach to area residents? SW – I'm going to assume that this doesn't change the fact that the helicopter use has not changed, it's an upgrade. A – must be coordinated with the F.A.A.

Results

Motion (BL/JM) to approve the helipad use (6-0-1).

Motion (BL/JM) to approve the design of the helipad and addition (6-0-1).

VI. Conceptual Review

Case #4 16-3-4C

31:18

Address: 358 Mt. Vernon Avenue**The View on Grant****Applicant:** JSDI Celmark, LTD.**Property Owner:** Ballet Met**Attorney:** James Maniace**Design Professional :** Jonathan Barnes Architecture and Design**Request:**

Conceptual review for the renovation of a five story former warehouse building into apartments, interior parking and café. Project involves the addition of three new stories on top and addition to the rear. Largely bricked in windows will be opened up. CC3359.05(C)1)

A conceptual review of this property occurred in July 2015. See attached Results. This is being submitted as another conceptual review. Since July, another story and more details have been added. Note: the new three stories will also extend over the Mt. Vernon Ave. R.O.W.

Discussion

JM & ML recuse themselves from this item. JB – The Commission has already approved new windows and entry. Some changes have occurred since then. New owner and larger addition – three stories. 80 units total, 43 parking spaces (41 are mechanical), retail off of Mt. Vernon. New 8th floor is terrace, lounge, fitness. Conceptual, but would like to get an approval for removal start for removal of window infill. 10 foot cantilever over Mt. Vernon which would need Public Service approval. Planning on painting masonry. Addition would be metal panel. Colors are not known at this time. MB – likes the old brick looking old. There will also be an addition on the north (12 ft.). SW – don't mind the cantilever but it looks like too much, sticking out too far. Do you need the square footage? Does the cantilever take away sun in the summer? JB – we could look into it. An easement application has yet to be made. RL – why this addition on this building? A. – we like contrasting with the existing structure, we want the addition to look separate / different – composition – size of openings, massing, materials. Next month, we hope to bring back materials and colors. RL – happy to see something happen to this building, it been sitting there for a long time. DP – a lot of the other new development is “all the same” – I like what you have done. SW – some things throw me – extent of cantilever, narrow vertical windows. MB – more contextual information would be helpful.

Results

Motion (BL/MB) to allow Removal Start for the project (5-0).

Case #5 16-3-5C

48:20

Address: 74 W. Mound Street**Certified Oil****Applicant:** Certified Oil Company, c/o Nick Lacaille**Property Owner:** Helen Cochrane and Victoria Palmer, LE**Agent:** David Perry, David Perry Company, Inc.**Design Professional :** Gieseke Rosenthal Architecture Design, LLC**Request:**

Conceptual review for the new gas station and convenience store to replace existing. CC3359.05(C)1) CC3359.23

The existing building and canopy is proposed to be demolished and replaced with the same use.

Discussion

This site has been used as a gas station for at least 60 years. The proposal will have fewer pumps but a larger store. Mound St. will become a one way street connecting to I-70. The current site layout necessitates these changes. Curb cut access, which is reflected in the new site plan, will be limited. SW – do you intend to put brick on all sides of the building? A – Yes. MB – this is a business that is existing. You’re based in Columbus and you are aware of what is happening downtown. This comes to me as a very predictable gas station. That could be anywhere. It’s nice, clean, but I’ve been in this before. – in the suburbs, what have you. This site would be an opportunity for you to do something more special., dramatic. A. – this is our new prototype, our new look. DP – it’s a major improvement on what is currently there, however, design does not fit this community. JM – I think that you can use the same materials. The biggest issue is the shape. How to make it more urban? Modify your new format to fit the context. Maybe more flat roof, clearstory, use the glass in a rectilinear way. Prototype with an urban variation. RL – we don’t have much of this type downtown, we’re happy to see reinvestment. ML – explore, could you flip the plan so the building is at the corner? RL – that was just done at E. Broad St. and James. (Speedway) Also Dodridge and High. (Turkey Hill). SW – I don’t think this is bad from a siting standpoint. A component will have to be signage. What does the Commission feel about the signage? A – prototype of a building in Hamilton, Ohio. SW – how about landscaping? MB – landscaping, lighting. MB – Timeline? A. – get to work when Mound St. is being torn up, basically between now and 2018. SW – in summation – largely positive, make it more urban.

Results

Conceptual review only

Case #6 16-3-6C

1:04:30

Address: 200 Civic Center Drive

Applicant: John Behal (Behal Sampson Dietz)

Property Owner: CC13 LLC

Design Professional : John Behal (Behal Sampson Dietz)

Request:

Conceptual review for skyline graphics at 200 S. Civic Center Drive. CC3359.05(C)1)
CC3359.07(D)

Discussion

Keith Witt w/ BSD – There are actually 11 sides (facades) to this building. Proposal is to reinstall new signage in the places where the old Columbia Gas signs were – NW, SW and E. Three signs altogether for three different tenants. Halo lit, channel letters are proposed. The signage shown is not actually a proposal of design, mostly as an indicator of placement and proportion. Feedback is sought. SW- Three signs maximum; signs need to have more interest. A – each of the three signs are independent. SW – generally okay.

Results

Conceptual review only

VII. Request for Certificate of Appropriateness for Advertising Murals

Case #7 16-3-7M

1:11:00

Library Opening ad mural

Address: 80 S. Sixth Street

Salesians Center

Applicant: Lamar Advertising

Property Owner: Salesians Society, INC.

Request:

Design review and approval for installation of a vinyl mesh advertising mural to be located on the east elevation of 80 S. Sixth Street. Proposed mural — Main Library – Open June 25. There have been numerous murals at this site, the last being for Buckeye Health Plan. CC3359.07(D).

Dimensions of mural: 24’W x 50’H, two dimensional, lit

Term of installation: Seeking approval from April 1 through July 1, 2016

Area of mural: 1,200 sf

Approximate % of area that is text: 5%

Discussion

Short run to announce the opening of the library.

Results

Motion (DP/MB) to approve as submitted (6-0-1).

Case #8 16-3-8M

1:12:30

Scotts Miracle Gro ad mural

Address: 88 W. Main Street

Applicant: Lamar Advertising

Property Owner: Annex at River South (as of 2-26-16)

Request:

Design review and approval for installation of a vinyl mesh advertising mural to be located on the east elevation of 88 W. Main Street. Proposed mural — Miracle-Gro edibles - “Live Plants – only at Meijer”. There have been no prior ad murals at this site. CC3359.07(D).

A mural was proposed at this site in 2014 (Orange Barrel for the New James) and was turned down by the Commission. See attached Results. In addition, this building is part of the recently Commission approved Matan project by Lifestyle.

Dimensions of mural: 30’W x 20’H, two dimensional, non lit

Term of installation: Seeking approval from April 4 through May 29, 2016

Area of mural: 640 sf

Approximate % of area that is text: 9%

Discussion

Change of property ownership. Clips would have been proposed. Lifestyle had given previous owner permission to lease wall to the end of 2017. A - Request that a conditional approval be given requiring new owner concurrence. SW – you have to get that before we issue a CoA. MB – this probably shouldn’t even be on the agenda.

A – Issue of clips. RL – it’s got 9% text. SW – are you willing to reduce the text? A – Willing to ask the client. JM – graphic looks commercial and even though the windows are blocked off, I do

not think this is appropriate. DP – you could get a little more art if you took the Meijer. RL – looking at some of the other subsequent proposals, they aren't as bad because there is less text. JM – has a hard time voting yes in any regard. It's not appropriate to this building. RL – since there aren't any clips now, the whole proportion of a new graphic could be reoriented – it would look a whole lot less like a billboard. It would miss the bricked windows. Suggests vertical orientation.

Results

Motion (RL/ML) to conditionally approve; condition to reduce text to 5% of ad mural. Include letter of approval from new owner. Resubmit electronically, and forward back to the Commissioners for their concurrence. (4-2-1) Brown, Maniace.

Case #9 16-3-9M

1:32

SMD & HLS Bail Bonds ad mural

Address: 88 W. Mound Street

Applicant: Outfront Media / HLS Bonding Company

Property Owner: Mound Street Partners / Kemp, Schaeffer & Rowe, Co., C.P.A.

Request: Design review and approval for installation of a vinyl mesh advertising mural to be located on the east elevation of 88 W. Mound Street. Proposed mural — SMD & HLS Bail Bonds – “Download our free bail bond App”. There have been no prior ad murals at this site. CC3359.07(D).

Dimensions of mural: 20'W x 25'H, two dimensional, non lit

Term of installation: Seeking approval from April 1 through October 1, 2016

Area of mural: 500 sf

Approximate % of area that is text: 4%

Discussion

A – Across from the courthouse. This is a new location. MB – it has a lot more text to my eye, what is counted as text? A - A lot of the text is part of the art. SW - This is not a good graphic. A – tried to come up with a concept that was artistic in nature, related to the mobile ap. Wanted to move away from type. RL – motion to approve. DP – 2nd. A – it will be up six months. There is no lighting. ML - I'm not seeing the art. Vote to approve – fails.

A – Is failure base on the art? Location? JM – I can live with the location, it's a little more commercial here. Concept is okay, it seems a little too busy and a little too commercial. I know you are trying to convey information, but if there were a way that if you first look at it, it looks like an interesting graphic. A. – we wanted it to be tasteful with the panic button. We could remove icons out of the cell phone. Hitting the panic button is the intent of the ad. The ap really does look like as it is shown.

MB – to me it is the location, we have a lot of locations downtown that have spread over the years. A system was created to basically encourage corporate sponsored art. I think it is too big on that space, I don't like the art. It's a new space, I don't see why we are justified in taking it. As opposed to making it a piece of public art that is corporate sponsored. At least make your murals more artistic so that they are dynamic. This is pure advertising and is not our goal. DP – this is very large, it's also busy with all of the activity that is going on in that area. Its stressful. It's an active filling station, an active corridor. JM – it's near the courthouse, an area of new development and we want this to elevate the area, not just a commercial put up all over.

A – we took the Commission's guidelines to avoid windows, not wrap the entire building. If you felt that the 20 x 25 was not the size, if there were an approvable size, I would look to the

Commission's guidance, I.e. shrinking the size by five feet. ML – smaller would be better. SW – I think that the image of the hand is big. If it were shrunk a third to a half and moved down a bit. It would be an improvement, I don't know how the others would regard it. I think we need to avoid not trying to design it here. A – my goal is to take your feedback and be in synch with the Commission. We tried to make this non billboard in nature. If you were more specific – i.e. reduce the size of the hand 30%. – we'd feel better about it. The client wishes to focus on the panic button.

ML – I understand that this is a hard subject to create art with. It's in your face, its big, it's not creative. I'm not sure what you do to make it more creative. Those are our standards. It's big at a new location. I could see it smaller. SW – if you wanted to bring something back, we'll look at it. You have a sense of where we're at.

Results

Motion (RL/DP) to approve as submitted (1-4-2 Motion Failed). For Loversidge

Case #10 16-3-10M

1:47:24

Vacation in Missouri ad mural

Address: 60 E. Spring Street

Applicant: Orange Barrel Media

Property Owner: JDS Spring LLC

Design Professional: Orange Barrel Media

Request:

Design review and approval for installation of a vinyl mesh advertising mural to be located on the east elevation of 60 E. Spring Street. Proposed mural — “Vacation in Missouri . . .” There have been numerous murals at this site, the last being for the Columbus Museum of Art. CC3359.07(D).

Dimensions of mural: Two at 35'-9"W x 19'-6"H, two dimensional, lit, vinyl mesh banners
Two at 30' W x 73' H

Term of installation: Seeking approval from April 8 to July 5, 2016

Area of murals: 5,774 sf

Percentage of area that is text: 5%

Discussion

JB - Successful campaign last summer, wishes to do it again.

Results

Motion (RL/MB) to approve as submitted (7-0).

Case #11 16-3-11M

1:49:04

Scotts Miracle-Gro ad mural

Address: 64 E. Broad Street

Applicant: Orange Barrel Media

Property Owner: KT Partners LLC

Design Professional: Orange Barrel Media

Request:

Design review and approval for installation of a vinyl mesh advertising mural to be located on the

east elevation of 64 E. Broad Street. Proposed mural — Miracle-Gro edibles - “Live Plants – only at Meijer”. There have been numerous murals at this site, the last being for the YMCA. CC3359.07(D).

Dimensions of mural: 20’W x 32’H, two dimensional, non lit

Term of installation: Seeking approval from April 1 through June 1, 2016

Area of mural: 640 sf

Approximate % of area that is text: 5%

Discussion

OB had discussions with the client about Commission requirements. Original images were altered. RL- I thought that this site was reserved for civic purposed. A – We tried to be sensitive, i.e. a plant is not a threatening thing. The YMCA is there now, we do try.

Results

Motion (ML/DP) to approve as submitted (5-1). Loversidge

Case #12 16-3-12M

1:52

Scotts Miracle-Gro ad mural

Address: 34 N. High Street

Applicant: Orange Barrel Media

Property Owner: Thirty Four Corp.

Design Professional: Orange Barrel Media

Request:

Design review and approval for installation of a vinyl mesh advertising mural to be located on the south elevation of 34 N. High Street. Proposed mural — Miracle-Gro edibles - “Live Plants – only at Meijer”. There have been numerous murals at this site, the last being for Discipline / Abuse – Where’s the Line? . CC3359.07(D).

Dimensions of mural: 20’W x 33’H, two dimensional, non lit

Term of installation: Seeking approval from April 1 through June 1, 2016

Area of mural: 660 sf

Approximate % of area that is text: 5%

Results

Motion (ML/MB) to approve as submitted (7-0).

Case #13 16-3-1

Scotts Miracle-Gro ad mural

Address: 82 N. High Street

Applicant: Orange Barrel Media

Property Owner: Haines Mansion LLC

Design Professional: Orange Barrel Media

Request:

Design review and approval for installation of a vinyl mesh advertising mural to be located on the north elevation of 82 N. High Street. Proposed mural — Miracle-Gro – “Edibles - Live Plants – only at Meijer”. There have been numerous murals at this site, the last being for Mellow Yellow. CC3359.07(D).

Dimensions of mural: 59'W x 49'H, two dimensional, non lit

Term of installation: Seeking approval from April 1 through June 1, 2016

Area of mural: 2,891 sf **Approximate % of area that is text:** 6% - includes "Miracle-Gro"

Discussion

Same size as what is there now. MB – text does look larger. A – we calculated 5%, staff calculated 6%. We'll go back and revise.

Results

Motion (RL/MB) to conditionally approve; condition to reduce text to 5% of ad mural (7-0).

Case #14 16-3-14M

Scotts Miracle Gro ad mural

Address: 145 N. High Street **The Brunson Building**

Applicant: Orange Barrel Media

Property Owner: Brunson Building LLC

Design Professional: Orange Barrel Media

Request:

Design review and approval for installation of a heat transfer vinyl advertising mural to be located on the north elevation of 145 N. High Street. Proposed mural — Miracle-Gro edibles - "Live Plants – only at Meijer". There have been numerous murals at this site, the last being for the Mid-Ohio Food Bank CC3359.07(D).

Dimensions of mural: 20'W x 80'H, two dimensional, non lit

Term of installation: Seeking approval from April 1 through June 1, 2016

Area of mural: 1,600 sf **Approximate % of area that is text:** 5%

Discussion

MB – the prior ad mural was a good mural. JB - The new proposal is shortened over what we have done before. RL – looks like a billboard and normally don't want to see murals on this façade. A – Condominium is anxious to have new murals. JM - Appreciate your efforts, but it's still part of a primary façade.

Results

Motion (DP/ML) to approve as submitted (3-1-2). Wittmann, not voting, Loversidge, Maniace – no

VIII. Business / Discussion 1:57

SW- Reported on administrative approval of revision to parking garage of Parks Edge.

Suggested a Business Meeting of the Commission – one of the things are panel, places built in for ad murals. These were originally intended for blank party walls. Murals have strayed in terms of content as well. Consistency is important. RL- Commented on the brightness of the Lamar display at Spring and High. ML – as far as new locations, perhaps we should get those approved first. Legal issues and consideration for code modification. Some locations have a precedence.

Public Forum

Staff Certificates of Appropriateness have been issued since last meeting (February 23, 2016)

1. 342 S. Third St. – Blade sign
2. 9 E. Long St. – Blade sign – reface
3. 37 N. Third St. – revised facade repair
4. 358 Mt. Vernon Ave. – lot split
5. 350 N. High St. – revamp AT&T cell antennas at Hyatt
6. 365 S. Fourth St. – Site Compliance – Driveway - CME Credit Union
7. 47 N. Pearl St. – El Arepazo Latin Grill - New porch floor, canvas roof – Mile On High project
8. 390 E Broad St. – CCAD temporary tents for Senior Fashion Show
9. 47 W. Broad St. – Parking blade sign (Front St. elevation)
10. 85 E. Gay St. - revamp AT&T cell antennas
11. 360 S. Third St. – United Way banner
12. 278 E Spring St. – Roofing
13. 217 N. Grant St. – Rear covered patios for Faith Mission
14. 101 E. Town St. – replace panel of existing 4 panel multi-tenant sign for Primrose School
15. 15 W. Cherry St. – Apple iPhone ad mural – Outfront Media
16. 43 W. Long St. – Apple iPhone ad mural – Orange Barrel
17. 60 E. Long St. – Apple iPhone ad mural – Orange Barrel
18. 285 N. Front St. – Apple iPhone ad mural – Orange Barrel
19. 35 W. Spring St. (Marriott Courtyard) – Apple iPhone ad mural – Lamar
20. 250 W. Spring – EdgePark Condominiums – Revision of Parking Garage Elevations – vetted with Chair

If you have questions concerning this agenda, please contact Daniel Thomas, Urban Design Manager, Planning Division at 645-8404. 2:09:38